

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached drawing(s) include changes to FIG. 5. The sheet containing FIG. 5 replaces the original sheet including FIG. 5. FIG. 5 has been revised to change "refrection: 2" to --reflection: 2-- to correct a spelling error.

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-14, 16-18, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33 and 34 have been cancelled. New claims 35-47 have been added. Claims 15, 19, 20, 23, 26, 29, 32 and 35-47 are pending and under consideration.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 19, 22, 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph for indefiniteness. Of these claims, claim 19 remains. Claim 19 recites "influence characteristics." This term has now been defined in the independent claim. Based on the claim changes, it is submitted that the indefiniteness rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 USC § 101. These claims have been cancelled.

Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,681,331 to Munson et al.

Various aspects of the present invention relate to a rendering calculation processing status monitoring program, a computer readable recording medium storing the program, a device for carrying out the monitoring operation and the method thereof. Although each independent claim is different and the Examiner is requested to separately review each, according to claim 15 information is stored on the rendering calculation processing of a rendering file that is performed with varying a plurality of parameters, the information including influencing characteristics that each parameter gives influence to the job on a processing transition of a processing example that is desirable for the user. Influencing characteristics are obtained. that each parameter gives influence to the job on a processing transition of a current rendering processing. The thus obtained influencing characteristics on the processing transition are compared with the influence characteristics on the processing transition of the processing example for each parameter. It is deciding whether the job is a processing suitable for the user during the execution of the job processing based on a predetermined rule. When the job is decided not to be a processing suitable for the user, the user is so notified. When the job has been decided as not suitable, a difference in the influencing characteristics of each parameter between the current rendering processing and the processing example is determined, and a parameter set with a greatest difference in value of the influencing characteristics is specified as a candidate parameter for correcting a set value.

Independent claim 47 relates to monitoring a user-requested job of a rendering, performed by making a plurality of parameter changes. According to claim 47, influencing characteristics are stored for a sample rendering that is desirable to the user, each influencing

characteristic describing how a parameter change influences the sample rendering. Influencing characteristics are obtained for the user-requested job such that an influencing characteristic is obtained for each parameter being changed in the user-requested job. For each parameter being changed, a difference is determined between the influencing characteristic for the user-requested job and the influencing characteristic for the sample rendering. Based on the differences, a decision is made regarding whether the user-requested job is suitable for the user. This is done during the execution of the user-requested job. If it is decided that the user-requested job is not suitable, the user is notified and potential parameters for correction are identified. The potential parameters for correction are the parameters having the greatest differences between the influencing characteristic for the user-requested job and the influencing characteristic for the sample rendering.

To the contrary, the ultimate purpose of Munson et al. is to provide a real time detection of aberrant modes of system behavior induced by abnormal or unauthorized system activities that are indicative of an intrusive, undesired access to the system. A comparison is made between a current profile 501 most recently obtained from the first profile transducer 202 and a nominal execution profile obtained from nominal profile data 506, which represents the steady state behavior of the software when there is no intrusive activity. A differenced profile is formed from the comparison. Thereafter, it is attempted to match the differenced profile with the known intrusion profiles data 505. See column 4, lines 26-35. Based on this process, changes to a sampling rate, for example, may be made. Perhaps the Examiner believes the invention and Munson et al. are similar because of the comparison.

However, the comparison conducted in Munson et al. is different from that in the present invention. Specifically, the present invention relates to a rendering operation. Rendering is defined in the specification at page 2, lines 18-24. Munson et al. does not disclose or suggest monitoring a rendering process using influencing characteristics, as claimed. Accordingly, the anticipation rejection should be withdrawn.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/029,801

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 5, 2005

By: Mark J. Henry
Mark J. Henry
Registration No. 36,162

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on July 5, 20 05
STAAS & HALSEY
By: Monica Fry
Date: 7-5-05